

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

These remarks are submitted in response to the Office Action of June 21, 2007 (Office Action). As this response is timely filed within the 3-month shortened statutory period, no fee is believed due. However, the Examiner is expressly authorized to charge any deficiencies to Deposit Account No. 50-0951.

Claims Rejections – 35 USC § 101

Claims 16-23 and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because it was alleged that the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

It is noted that the system recited in claims 16-23 and 38 is not a software per se; rather it consists of different means or modules which can be implemented as hardware or a combination of hardware and software, and thus falls within the statutory category of a machine or a product. It is also noted that an invention can be implemented in different ways. It is unreasonable to reject the claims just because it is stated in the specification that the invention can be realized as software. Nevertheless, in order to facilitate the prosecution, Claims 16-23 and 38 have been amended to specifically recite a "computer system."

Applicants thus respectfully request that the claims rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101 be withdrawn.

Claims Rejections – 35 USC §§ 102 & 103

Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Published Patent Application 2005/0086309 to Galli, *et al.* (hereinafter Galli).

Claims 1-3, 5-13, 15-17, 19-26, and 28-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,791,582 to Linsey, *et al.* (hereinafter Linsey) in view of Galli, and further in view of "Blogging: Genius Strategies for Instant Web

Content", by Biz Stone, Publisher: New Riders, Pub. Date September 11, 2002 (hereinafter Stone).

Claims 4, 18, and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lindsey, Galli, and Stone, in further view of U.S. Patent 7,069,003 to Lehtikainen, *et al.* (hereinafter Lehtikainen).

Claims 37-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Galli in view of Lehtikainen.

Although Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejections, Applicants nevertheless have amended certain claims so as to expedite prosecution of the present application by emphasizing certain aspects of the invention. Applicants respectfully note, however, that the amendments are not intended as, and should not be interpreted as, the surrender of any subject matter. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully reserve the right to present the original version of any of the amended claims in any future divisional or continuation applications from the present application.

Applicants have amended independent Claims 1, 14-16, 24, and 37-39 to further emphasize certain aspects of the invention. As discussed herein, the claim amendments are fully supported throughout the Specification. No new matter has been introduced by the claim amendments.

Claim 14 Defines Over Galli

Galli discloses a system and method for stacking a number of software application agents on top of an instant messenger application. Each of the software application agents establishes a connection with a third-party Web service on the Internet or a local application in the user's computer. However, Galli does not disclose that the instant messenger client itself is configured to compile a transcript generated during an instant messaging session. Rather, in Galli, the instant messenger client has to register to such a service from a third-party if such a service is available. As described in paragraph 37, lines 13-15 of Galli, the IMLet, when registered by a user of the RIM service, runs *on top*

of the RIM service application. Clearly, the IMLet is not part of the instant messenger client.

Although it is described in paragraph 109 of Galli that during an instant messaging session, a conversation can be published to a Web log service via an IMLet specifically implemented for this purpose, Galli does not specifically disclose that the instant messaging client "automatically publishes the transcript of the instant messaging session to the Weblog server responsive to a user request or a scheduled event," as recited in Claim 14. In other words, Galli does not disclose when and how the transcript will be published.

Claim 14 is, therefore, believed to be patentable over Galli.

**Claims 1-3, 5-13, 15-17, 19-26, and 28-36 Are
Patentable over Linsey in view of Galli and further in view of Stone**

Linsey discloses a method and system for managing collaboration space by providing users of the collaboration space a report of events and happenings that are of current interest. Although in Linsey the users may be allowed to copy the transcripts of a chat into a QuickPlace page or to save the chat as a whole as a page (see column 32, lines 23-36), Linsey does not disclose that the instant messaging client is configured to compile a transcript and publish the transcript to a Weblog. The QuickPlace is actually similar to an instant messaging server that facilitates instant messaging among the instant messaging clients.

Therefore, Linsey does not disclose compiling and publishing a transcript of an instant messaging session to a Weblog by an instant messaging client, as recited in independent Claims 1, 15-16, and 24. As discussed above, this feature is also not disclosed by Galli because in Galli a third-party service is required to be stacked on top of the instant messenger application. Stone does not make up for the differences between Linsay-Galli and the present invention.

Accordingly, Linsay, Galli and Stone, alone or any combination thereof, fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of Claims 1, 15-16, and 24, as amended. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that amended Claims 1, 15-16, and 24 define over the cited prior art. Furthermore, as each of the claims 3, 5-13, 17, 19-23, 25-26, and 28-36 dependents from Claim 1, 16 or 24 while reciting additional features, Applicants further respectfully submit that the remaining claims likewise define over the prior art.

**Claims 4, 18, and 27 Are Patentable over
Linsey, Galli, and Stone further in view of Lehikoinen**

As discussed above, independent Claims 1, 16, and 24 are believed to be patentable over the cited references. Claims 4, 18, and 27 are ultimately dependent on Claims 1, 16, or 24 while reciting additional features. Applicants respectfully submit, therefore, that these claims likewise define over the prior art.

**Claims 37-39 Are Patentable over
Galli and further in view of Lehikoinen**

As discussed above, Galli does not disclose that the instant messenger client itself is configured to compile and store a transcript of an instant messaging session. Lehikoinen does not make up for the difference between Galli and the present invention. Claims 37-39 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over Galli in view of Lehikoinen.

In view of the forgoing, Applicants respectfully request that the claims rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 & 103 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that this application is now in full condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. Applicants request that the Examiner call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this Amendment, or if the

Appln. No. 10/736,025
Amendment dated February 7, 2008
Reply to Office Action of December 7, 2007
Docket No. BOC9-2003-0069 (440)

Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 7, 2008



Gregory A. Nelson, Registration No. 30,577
Richard A. Hinson, Registration No. 47,652
Yonghong Chen, Registration No. 56,150
AKERMAN SENTERFITT
Customer No. 40987
Post Office Box 3188
West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188
Telephone: (561) 653-5000